



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Soil microbes and community coalescence

Rillig, M. C., Lehmann, A., Aguilar-Trigueros, C. A. ., Antonovics, J., Caruso, T., Hempel, S., Lehmann, J., Valyi, K., Verbruggen, E., Veresoglou, S. D., & Powell, J. R. (2016). Soil microbes and community coalescence. *Pedobiologia*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedobi.2016.01.001>

Published in:
Pedobiologia

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

© 2016 Elsevier GmbH. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>, which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Soil microbes and community coalescence

Matthias C. Rillig^{1,2*}, Anika Lehmann^{1,2}, Carlos A. Aguilar-Trigueros^{1,2}, Janis Antonovics³,
Tancredi Caruso⁴, Stefan Hempel^{1,2}, Johannes Lehmann⁵, Kriszta Valyi^{1,2}, Erik Verbruggen⁶,
Stavros D. Veresoglou^{1,2}, Jeff R. Powell⁷

¹*Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Biologie, Plant Ecology, D-14195 Berlin, Germany*

²*Berlin-Brandenburg Institute of Advanced Biodiversity Research (BBIB), D-14195 Berlin, Germany*

³*Department of Biology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904, USA*

⁴*School of Biological Sciences and Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast BT9 7BL, Northern Ireland, UK*

⁵*Atkinson Center for a Sustainable Future, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA*

⁶*Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, PLECO (Plant and Vegetation Ecology), 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium*

⁷*Western Sydney University, Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Penrith NSW, 2751 Australia*

*Author for correspondence. Matthias C. Rillig, Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Biologie, Plant Ecology, Altensteinstr. 6, D-14195 Berlin, Germany. Email matthias.rillig@fu-berlin.de.

Running title: Microbial community coalescence

Word count: 1724 (without references); **Figures count:** 1

Abstract

Community coalescence is a recently introduced term describing the interaction of entire communities and their environments. We here explicitly place the concept of community coalescence in a soil microbial context, exploring intrinsic and extrinsic drivers of such coalescence events. Examples of intrinsic events include the action of earthworms and the dynamics of soil aggregates, while extrinsic events are exemplified by tillage, flooding, litter-fall, outplanting, and the addition of materials containing microbial communities. Aspects of global change may alter the frequency or severity of coalescence events. We highlight functional consequences of community coalescence in soil, and suggest ways to experimentally tackle this phenomenon. Soil ecology as a whole stands to benefit from conceptualizing soil biodiversity in terms of dynamic coalescent microbial assemblages.

Keywords: community coalescence, metacommunity, soil biodiversity, global change, community, disturbance

1. Introduction

Community coalescence is a recently coined term (Rillig et al., 2015) describing situations where two or more entire communities (and their environments) interact because pieces of the environment that are large relative to the size of the organisms they contain can be translocated by a variety of forces. While such interactions of whole communities are hard to envisage in the normal context of plant and animal ecology, community coalescence among microbes, especially in the soil, is likely an ever-present feature. Community coalescence is only partially encompassed by existing metacommunity theory (Rillig et al., 2015; Fig. 1; also see there for a pertinent discussion of microbial biogeography), which captures the idea of connectedness, but not of wholesale exchange of environments and communities. To understand the latter in a soil context where community coalescence is likely to be common, thus necessitates a fresh look at features of such exchanges in order to develop suitable theory and experimental approaches. The purpose of this contribution is to more explicitly place the concept of community coalescence in a soil microbial context.

Many examples of wholesale exchanges between microbial communities come from the aquatic literature (Livingston et al., 2013; Adams et al., 2014; Souffreau et al., 2014), where

flows and confluence of water bodies are the natural force driving such mixing. Here we highlight such coalescence events in soils, and explore how they may help explain the large microbial biodiversity and its spatial and temporal organization. Soils are uniquely suited for thinking about community coalescence, because coalescent phenomena are likely to be commonplace there. Soil microbial soil communities are likely to provide the major systems in which coalescent processes are both functionally important and where they can be empirically investigated. This is in part because soil microbes are at the base of the soil food web, and play key roles for ecosystem processes including interactions regulating plant communities (Bever et al. 2010).

In the following, we differentiate between intrinsic (naturally occurring via ecological interactions) and extrinsic (as a result of external influences and disturbance) sources of coalescent events in soil. We separate between these events to illustrate how commonly occurring soil processes can be understood in the light of community coalescence. Both cases have in common the initial development of separate communities, with different abiotic conditions and community composition, which are abruptly mixed by those events.

2. Soil-intrinsic coalescence events

Here, we focus on soil-intrinsic coalescence events, and consider external drivers of such events in the next section (see also Fig. 1). First we also need to ask: where (and what) are the microbial communities in soil? Assemblages of organisms can be described at various spatial and temporal scales, and for our purposes we explicitly take a microbial vantage point. Beare et al. (1995), for example, designated various arenas of activities in soil, acknowledging the large physiochemical and community differences that exist in soil, sometimes in very close proximity. Importantly, these fine-scale differences in microbial assemblages potentially provide the source communities engaging in coalescence events. We illustrate this for two examples, earthworms and soil aggregates.

Earthworms. - The activity of earthworms is a particularly intriguing case of microbial community coalescence, as assemblages from various microhabitats are literally mixed up (Barois et al., 1993), e.g. by breaking up aggregates, then experiencing a passage through the gut, there encountering the earthworm gut microbial assemblage, before being finally released back into the soil (Fig. 1c). The pervasive effects of earthworms on various soil and ecosystem parameters have long been recognized. The perspective we offer here is that the

continuous mixing of various soil microbial communities (for example breaking up of soil aggregates), together with mixing of environments, e.g., earthworm gut physicochemical conditions, organic matter pieces, will generate persistent “non-equilibrium” environmental heterogeneity. Similar effects will also occur in other animals inhabiting the soil, such as microarthropods or nematodes, but effects will be much larger with earthworms.

Soil aggregates. -Soil aggregates are the building blocks of soil structure, creating pore spaces and providing microbial microhabitats of extreme difference at a very fine spatial scale. For example, aggregate interiors can be anaerobic, differing in a number of physicochemical properties, and as a consequence harbor microbial assemblages quite different from those in the exterior surfaces (Tiedje et al., 1984; Sexstone et al., 1985; Mummey et al., 2006). Disintegration of an aggregate exposes the interior to quite different microbial assemblages (Fig. 1g).

The sum of these short-term and local encounter (and re-encounter) events determines the total microbial assemblage at broader scales, including spatial and temporal heterogeneity in the distribution of the assemblage. Even though these processes must be common in soils, and have been documented phenomenologically in the extensive literature on soil disturbance, no study has investigated how community diversity changes during these events, what novel interactions are generated, or how diversity is increased or decreased (i.e. local extinctions; Veresoglou et al. 2015) by such coalescence.

3. Human-mediated or externally driven community coalescence events

Many external influences and disturbances would be expected to trigger fine-scaled coalescence events in the soil (Fig. 1). Examples include tillage (Fig. 1h), flooding, litter-fall, outplanting, and the addition of materials containing microbial communities, e.g. compost, stored biochar, or manure (Fig. 1d). While the net effects of all these events have been well studied, the microbial community coalescence aspect remains unquantified and poorly understood; for example, the consequences of material additions to agricultural fields are frequently examined, yet these studies do not disentangle microbial community encounters from the effects of organic matter addition. Flooding is also an interesting case where subsoil communities, which differ in microbes and carbon dynamics (Fierer et al., 2003), would encounter the topsoil community.

Global change can change the frequency and severity of these external drivers and thus also of coalescence events. For example, any global change factor affecting primary production (e.g. warming, elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide, artificial light at night) can have ripple-on effects on litter composition, thus creating different sized pulses of microbial inputs entering the soil system. Human-associated pathways also include accidental transport of soil (Hughes et al., 2010; Cowan et al., 2011; MacNeill et al., 2011), yet the extent to which such community coalescence events promote or hinder the dispersal of different types of microbial components is not known.

4. Functional consequences

Given that community coalescence may be a common feature in soils, what does this mean for soil microbial community composition, biodiversity and ecosystem function?

Microbial communities in close proximity, such as in root-associated habitats or those inhabiting interiors or exteriors of soil aggregates, will have contrasting trait distributions. Depending on the frequency and mixing ratios of community coalescence events, community encounters will result in very different average trait distributions compared to the initial communities before the coalescence events. These new configurations of functional traits will in turn affect plant productivity, decomposition and nutrient cycling. As ecosystem processes encompass quite different habitats within the root-soil system, coalescence will play a major role as a mechanism underlying the relationship between soil microbial diversity and ecosystem functioning (e.g. Bell et al., 2005).

The coalescence of very divergent microbial communities from different soil compartments, and even their temporary coexistence, may also offer enhanced opportunities for horizontal gene transfer (Cruz and Davles, 2000), which itself will have important evolutionary and functional consequences, e.g. antibiotic resistance (Rillig et al., 2015). While such co-occurrence could also be caused by regular dispersal events, the sheer scale of exchange during coalescence is likely to be much larger and involve a greater diversity of species.

5. The way forward - how to study this phenomenon?

A long term research goal is to identify the contribution of community coalescence to the composition and function of the microbial soil biota. This is now possible because of high-

throughput sequencing, but even with the advances in such methods, there are huge challenges, given the fine-scale heterogeneity and complexity of the soil environment, not to mention the huge diversity of microbial taxa. Hence it will be necessary to initially focus on clearly delineated, experimentally tractable compartments, for which soil ecology has already amassed a solid background. The litter-soil interaction is one such system, as is the study of community coalescence in soil aggregate turnover. The former has easily defined and experimentally realizable assemblages, the latter addresses the very essence of soil complexity and structure. Dedicated experiments to disentangle the effects of the movement of the communities from additions of other material during coalescence will be important. For example, in litter-soil interactions, experimentally uncoupling the effects of organic matter addition from the microbial community addition is a challenge. Studies (Koide et al., 2005; Osono, 2005), using culture-based methods, showed that adding sterilized leaves (i.e. without endophytes) to soil led to distinct fungal communities in the leaf litter compared to litter where the endophyte community was not excluded. Similar studies, with a focus on other soil compartments, are feasible and could shed light on the magnitude of effects on both community assembly and functions.

Many organisms have adaptations to exploit regular "meeting" of or re-exposure to different communities and environments. Because of their economic and medical significance, the best examples we have come from parasites, such as gut nematodes and protozoans, many of which rely on the regular contact of soil and gut communities in order to complete their life-cycles. Extending the focus from specific parasites to other "free-living" members of the community around them would be a well worthwhile endeavor. For example identifying which microbes are regularly found in the plant and the soil, or in the gut microbiome and the soil, and asking how they differ in their traits from those that are confined to each compartment alone would be a useful starting point for such research. Although we know of no detailed comparative study of soil and gut microbiota, co-infection by soil/water transmitted gut parasites is well established (Brooker and Clements 2009; Knowles et al. 2013). In plants, based on metagenomic analysis of plant compartments and soil, Zarraonaindia et al. (2015) have suggested that "the soil serves as a primary reservoir for potential plant-associated bacteria", and Bai et al. (2015) have shown substantial taxonomic and functional overlap of root and leaf microbiota in *Arabidopsis*. Parasites with life-cycle components in host and soil compartments are evidence that coalescence events can contribute soil microbial diversity, but we need further studies to quantify this for the whole community. Focusing on parasitic microbes themselves, and identifying other microbes with

185 correlated distributions and therefore potentially moving with them could provide a useful
186 community module on which to focus for the study of coalescence.

187 Many innovations in design and approach await study of coalescing soil assemblages.
188 Observational approaches and directed sampling may be very productive in addressing
189 recurrent examples of coalescence such as leaf-litter fall. Equally, it is possible to envisage
190 numerous and imaginative experimental approaches to understanding the impact of
191 coalescence. For example, how would preventing microbial entry through leaf fall change the
192 endophytic microbiome of a tree? How much does the functioning of this endophytic
193 microbiome depend on recurring re-exposure to the leaf-inhabiting community? Importantly,
194 soil ecology as a whole stands to benefit from conceptualizing soil biodiversity in terms of
195 dynamic coalescent microbial assemblages.

196

197

References

- Adams HE, Crump BC, Kling GW. Metacommunity dynamics of bacteria in an arctic lake: the impact of species sorting and mass effects on bacterial production and biogeography. *Frontiers in Microbiology* (2014) **5**:82. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2014.00082.
- Bai Y, Müller DB, Srinivas G, Garrido-Oter R, Potthoff E, Rott M, Dombrowski N, Münch PC, Spaepen S, Remus-Emsermann M, Hüttel B, McHardy AC, Vorholt JA, Schulze-Lefert P. Functional overlap of the Arabidopsis leaf and root microbiota. *Nature* (2015) 528:364–369.
- Barois I, Villemin G, Lavelle P, Toutain F. Transformation of the soil structure through *Pontoscolex corethrurus* (Oligochaeta) intestinal tract. *Geoderma* (1993) **56**:57-66.
- Beare MH, Coleman DC, Crossley DA, Hendrix PF, Odum EP. A hierarchical approach to evaluating the significance of soil biodiversity to biogeochemical cycling. *Plant and Soil* (1995) **170**:5-22.
- Bell T, Newman JA, Silverman BW, Turner SL, Lilley AK. The contribution of species richness and composition to bacterial services. *Nature* (2005) **436**:1157–1160.
- Bever JD, Dickie IA, Facelli E, Facelli JM, Klironomos JN, Moora M, Rillig MC, Stock WD, Tibbett M, Zobel M. Rooting theories of plant ecology in microbial interactions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* (2010) **25**:468-478.
- Brooker S, Clements ACA. Spatial heterogeneity of parasite co-infection: Determinants and geostatistical prediction at regional scales. *International Journal of Parasitology* (2009) **39**: 591-597.
- Cowan DA, Chown SL, Convey P, Tuffin M, Elughes K, Pointing S, Vincent WF. Non-indigenous microorganisms in the Antarctic: assessing the risks. *Trends in Microbiology* (2011) **19**:540-548.
- de la Cruz F, Davies J. Horizontal gene transfer and the origin of species: lessons from bacteria. *Trends in Microbiology* (2000) **8**:128-133.
- Fierer N, Allen AS, Schimel JP, Holden PA. Controls on microbial CO₂ production: a comparison of surface and subsurface soil horizons. *Global Change Biology* (2003) **9**:1322-1332.
- Hughes KA, Convey P, Maslen NR, Smith RIL. Accidental transfer of non-native soil organisms into Antarctica on construction vehicles. *Biological Invasions* (2010) **12**:875-891.
- Koide K, Osono T, Takeda H. Colonization and lignin decomposition of *Camellia japonica* leaf litter by endophytic fungi. *Mycoscience* (2005) **46**:280-286.

- Knowles SCL, Fenton A, Petchey OL, Jones TR, Barber R, Pedersen AB. Stability of within-host parasite communities in a wild mammal system. *Proceedings of the Royal Society Series B* (2013) **280**:201305598.
- Livingston G, Jiang Y, Fox JW, Leibold MA. The dynamics of community assembly under sudden mixing in experimental microcosms. *Ecology* (2013) **94**:2898-2906.
- McNeill M, Phillips C, Young S, Shah F, Aalders L, Bell N, Gerard E, Littlejohn R. Transportation of nonindigenous species via soil on international aircraft passengers' footwear. *Biological Invasions* (2011) **13**:2799-2815.
- Mummey DL, Rillig MC, Six J. Endogeic earthworms differentially influence bacterial communities associated with different soil aggregate size fractions. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* (2006) **38**:1608-1614.
- Osono T. Colonization and succession of fungi during decomposition of *Swida controversa* leaf litter. *Mycologia* (2005) **97**:589-597.
- Rillig MC, Antonovics J, Caruso T, Lehmann A, Powell JR, Veresoglou SD, Verbruggen E. Interchange of entire communities: microbial community coalescence. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* (2015) **30**:470-476.
- Sexstone AJ, Revsbech NP, Parkin TB, Tiedje JM. Direct measurement of oxygen profiles and denitrification rates in soil aggregates. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* (1985) **49**:645-651.
- Souffreau C, Pecceu B, Denis C, Rummens K, De Meester L. An experimental analysis of species sorting and mass effects in freshwater bacterioplankton. *Freshwater Biology* (2014) **59**:2081-2095.
- Tiedje JM, Sexstone AJ, Parkin TB, Revsbech NP, Shelton DR. Anaerobic processes in soil. *Plant and Soil* (1984) **76**:197-212.
- Veresoglou SD, Halley J, Rillig MC. Extinction risk of soil biota. *Nature Communications* (2015) **6**: 8862.
- Zarraonaindia I, Owens SM, Weisenhorn P, West K, Hampton-Marcell J, Lax S, Bokulich NA, Mills DA, Martin G, Taghavi S, van der Lelie D, Gilbert JA. The soil microbiome influences grapevine-associated microbiota. *mBio* (2015) **6**(2):e02527-14.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Conceptual overview depicting metacommunity and coalescence phenomena occurring in soils, divided into intrinsically (a, c, e, g) and extrinsically (b, d, f, h) driven events (see text). The distinction between metacommunity dynamics and community coalescence is depicted as the degree of species (and environmental) exchange along the x-axis, in reality a continuum ranging from individual species dispersing to the wholesale interchange characteristic of community coalescence. The y-axis shows the degree of difference between the source environments for either metacommunity or community coalescence events. Picture inserts illustrate examples and text describes the nature and outcome of exchanges among communities. In the metacommunity examples, red colored organisms represent established and green colored the newly arriving species. For the coalescence examples, the red, green and yellow colored shapes display different communities.